

**DRAFT SUMMARIZED MINUTES  
SCOTTSDALE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
Regular Meeting**



**THURSDAY, JULY 20, 2006  
CITY HALL KIVA  
3939 N. DRINKWATER BOULEVARD  
SCOTTSDALE, ARIZONA 85251**

**PRESENT:** Mark Gilliland, Chair  
Brian Davis, Vice-Chair  
Kelly McCall, Commissioner  
Matthew Taunton, Commissioner  
Andrea Michaels, Commissioner  
Josh Weiss, Commissioner

**ABSENT:** William Howard, Commissioner

**STAFF PRESENT:** Rose Arballo, Transportation Commission Coordinator  
Mary O'Connor, Transportation General Manager  
Dave Meinhart, Transportation Planning and Transit Director  
George Williams, Senior Traffic Engineer  
Teresa Huish, Principal Transportation Planner

**OTHERS:** Marc Soronson, HDR - SR Beard  
Jim Slaker, HDR - SR Beard

**CALL TO ORDER**

The Regular Meeting of the Scottsdale Transportation Commission was called to order by Chairman Gilliland at 6:10 p.m.

**ROLL CALL**

A formal roll call confirmed the members present as stated above.

1. **INTRODUCTION OF NEW COMMISSIONER, MR. JOSH WEISS**

At the invitation of Chair Mark Gilliland, Mr. Weiss introduced himself.

2. **APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES**

**Study Session of the Transportation Commission - June 15, 2006**

**Regular Meeting of the Transportation Commission - June 15, 2006**

Commissioner McCall noted that on the second paragraph of page 6 of the Regular meeting minutes, the reference should be to the Transportation Acceleration Summit. The copy of a

slide presentation was in the packet and the slides refer to "copies of the presentations," saying that these will be posted on the website. She inquired whether there were more than one presentation. Ms. O'Connor replied that there were actually several more presentations at the Transportation Acceleration Summit, but staff is waiting to receive those additional copies.

**COMMISSIONER McCALL MOVED TO APPROVE THE CORRECTED MINUTES OF THE JUNE 15TH, 2006 REGULAR MEETING AND STUDY SESSION. COMMISSIONER MICHAELS SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED BY A UNANIMOUS VOTE OF SIX (6) TO ZERO (0).**

3. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

None.

4. **TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN UPDATE - HIGH CAPACITY TRANSIT**

Commissioner Taunton declared a conflict of interest concerning this agenda item and excused himself from voting, discussion, and participation in this matter.

Ms. Teresa Huish, Principal Transportation Planner, gave a presentation focused on an overview of high capacity transit.

She reported that staff is currently testing alternative scenarios developed through the public input process. Intensive public engagement will resume in the fall.

Highlights of Ms. Huish's presentation included different mode and corridor alternatives explored by Scottsdale and Tempe. The three different technologies City Council forwarded for study for the Scottsdale corridor are bus rapid transit, light rail transit, and modern streetcar. Regional coordination is a prime concern and staff has been meeting with numerous outside agencies.

Mr. Marc Soronson of HDR/SR Beard reviewed the three technologies under evaluation, discussing the advantages and disadvantages of the three technologies as they are envisioned for Scottsdale. He concluded his presentation with a chart summarizing the comparison.

Ms. Huish clarified that the transit stations could be as long as a football field as was described, but would be narrow (the width of a vehicle travel lane). The Department is involved in several regional studies that are looking at how bus rapid transit service would be accomplished on the freeways as well as on the arterial streets.

Ms. O'Connor clarified that there are no federal subsidies for high capacity transit operations, only for capital costs. She noted that the cost per rider is higher for bus rapid transit, although costs per mile are comparable. This is because buses carry fewer passengers than the modern streetcar or light rail vehicles.

Ms. Huish reviewed the assumptions underlying the study. The system is assumed to connect to the Phoenix-East Valley Light Rail Transit corridor. Another assumption is that no more than two technologies will be used on the Scottsdale Road corridor. Current major destinations are Downtown Scottsdale and SkySong; the Airpark and Loop 101 will be included in the long-term 20-year study. Highlights of Ms. Huish's presentation included alternatives under consideration (Tier 1 analysis); high capacity transit evaluation criteria; a discussion of the process to be followed; and criteria for the Tier 2 analysis. The Tier 1 and Tier 2 analyses are federally

required procedures. Ms. Huish explained that staff is looking for feedback from the Commissioners on their study to date.

Commissioner McCall thanked Ms. Huish for a great presentation. She asked Ms. Huish about the next steps in the process. Ms. Huish replied that through the fall and early winter, staff would evaluate the alternatives through the public process. This will include the Tier 2 analysis and a final recommendation for the Locally Preferred Alternative.

In response to a follow-up question from Commissioner McCall, Ms. Huish replied that the detailed evaluation of the Tier 2 criteria will be done and the locally preferred alternative should be identified by October. Commissioner McCall asked about the advantages and disadvantages of the various technologies and specifically if all modes could operate in mixed traffic. Ms. O'Connor clarified that all of the technologies have the ability to operate in mixed traffic; light rail transit in this region has not operated extensively in mixed traffic, bus rapid transit in the region has operated in exclusive right-of-ways but in other regions operates in mixed traffic, and modern streetcar generally has the capability to operate in mixed traffic. Mr. Soronson added that the central Phoenix light rail transit system project would not operate in mixed traffic. However, extensions to the Phoenix system could be designed to operate in mixed traffic.

Commissioner McCall inquired about the turning radius for streetcars and light rail transit. Ms. Huish clarified that these modes have a wider arc than buses, due to their length. Commissioner McCall asked whether this difference accounts for a significant part of the capital cost of the Phoenix system. Mr. Soronson replied that the cost depends on the intersection. Commissioner Michaels commented there are not too many turns in the Scottsdale Road corridor. Ms. O'Connor agreed.

Commissioner McCall inquired whether the platform would be at the same level as the vehicle in all three modes. Mr. Meinhart confirmed that it would.

Commissioner McCall asked for a noise comparison between the modes. Mr. Soronson noted that buses are the noisiest of the three technologies because of the diesel or hybrid engine. Light rail transit and streetcars are quiet enough that residences and gathering places such as cafes can be built closer to the tracks.

Commissioner McCall asked about direct connections with the Phoenix light rail transit. Mr. Soronson replied that if a connection could be made in Tempe, it would be possible to interline so that the journey from Scottsdale into central Phoenix could be accomplished in one vehicle without the need to transfer.

Commissioner McCall asked about the potential for changes to traffic patterns if left-hand turns would be prohibited. In the case of light rail transit, Mr. Soronson clarified that left turns would be controlled by traffic signals and would be prohibited where there are no signals. With streetcar and bus rapid transit, restrictions would depend on the system design. Ms. O'Connor added that this is a question of how the technology would function in mixed traffic.

Commissioner McCall inquired about impacts to businesses in south Scottsdale. Ms. O'Connor noted that sensitivity to the needs of small businesses is crucial. Mr. Soronson agreed this is always an issue when there are changes in land use. Phoenix and Tempe have adopted ordinances to encourage land uses that support transit, by limiting parking, bringing storefronts closer to the street, and designing a more pedestrian-oriented environment.

Ms. O'Connor stressed no matter which technology is adopted, the City's goal would be to protect existing businesses by addressing access concerns. Mr. Soronson recalled working intensively with smaller businesses on Apache Boulevard in Tempe.

Commissioner McCall raised issues mentioned in the community mobility document (General Plan). A significant amount of Scottsdale traffic is pass-through traffic. She asked that the three technologies be rated for their appeal to pass-through traffic. Commissioner McCall inquired about the comparative safety of the different technologies. Finally, she asked whether the different modes could carry bikes.

Ms. O'Connor clarified that pass-through traffic was a characteristic before the Loop 101 freeway opened. Further analysis is being conducted through the Transportation Master Plan to document whether this is significant today, and how significant it is expected to be in the future. She indicated with regard to community goals, staff might subdivide some of the criteria on the list of community goals in order to be able to rank pass through travel vs. within the community. She also indicated that the criteria would include safety. Mr. Soronson stated that light rail transit vehicles would have bike racks inside the vehicle and that streetcars can be configured in a similar way. Bus rapid transit would have the bike racks outside the vehicle. All technologies can accommodate bicycles.

Chair Gilliland reiterated Commissioner McCall's inquiry about a safety comparison between technologies. Mr. Soronson said he currently has no data to enable a meaningful comparison of accident rates, which vary depending on design. The information could be compiled from different cities around the country.

Commissioner McCall asked about the possibility of running modern streetcars on the light rail transit tracks. Ms. Huish clarified that modern streetcar can be operated on the light rail transit system, but it would not be possible to operate a light rail train on the streetcar lines. Commissioner McCall asked whether it would be feasible to run a streetcar service from Scottsdale to Sky Harbor without needing to transfer.

Mr. Soronson replied this potentially could be possible. It would be a question of operational compatibility and would be challenging. A discussion ensued.

Commissioner McCall asked for an explanation of a passage from the three-page handout: "Alternatives may include alignment sub-options and various technologies." Ms. Huish replied that in any of the five alternatives on tonight's slide, it would be possible to do sub-design options. For example a streetcar line might have a fixed guideway for part of its route and run in mixed traffic for another part of the route. These are details to be decided later when the technologies have been selected.

Commissioner McCall asked for an explanation of the phrase "transportation system management alternative." Mr. Soronson replied that to obtain federal funding, a comparison must be made between each technology and a transportation system management alternative, which is a low-cost rubber tire type operation.

Commissioner McCall asked Ms. Huish to define "community" as used in the document. Ms. Huish replied that this includes property owners, citizens, residents, businesses, and employees.

Commissioner McCall asked why the information on population served includes minority population and low-income population. Ms. Huish explained that this is part of the Federal Transit Administration's criteria for evaluating transit systems.

Commissioner Michaels asked Ms. O'Connor to explain her comment about how information about "operation in this region" affects the decision-making process, as opposed to looking at experience in other cities.

Ms. O'Connor replied that parameters/guidelines have been set, or are being set, by the Valley Metro Rail organization, for how light rail transit will operate in this region. If Scottsdale chooses to connect to or operate within that system, we would have to operate within those parameters. There is also an existing bus rapid transit service in operation in the Valley; however it operates on the HOV lanes of the freeways, not on arterial streets. Valley Metro is currently studying arterial bus rapid transit and Scottsdale is involved, and that study may set regional parameters that would affect how bus rapid transit operates. Tucson may adopt modern streetcar, but that would not set parameters for this region or affect how streetcar service might operate in Scottsdale. Streetcar service would not fit under the parameters being created by Valley Metro Rail under either of their studies, so Scottsdale may have an opportunity to set its own parameters.

Commissioner Michaels followed up by asking what the parameters encompass. Ms. O'Connor commented that they relate to a variety of things; examples include station design, other design elements such as the use of paved or unpaved track, operating in mixed traffic vs. exclusive right of way, vehicle types and vehicle design components, operating parameters such as fare structure and fare mechanisms, presence/absence of transit security, and a host of other matters. Mr. Soronson added that Valley Metro is in the process of completing a design criteria manual, which will be the guidance manual for design of the regional rail system.

Commissioner Michaels asked whether the bus rapid transit service on the HOV lanes would have doors on the left side as proposed for the Scottsdale Road corridor service. Mr. Soronson replied that buses could be configured with doors on both sides. The driver would control which doors would open. Commissioner Michaels asked whether having doors on both sides of the buses would cost more. Ms. O'Connor replied that she is unsure whether this has been figured into the regional cost projections.

Commissioner Michaels inquired how the operating cost estimates are expressed. Mr. Soronson stated they are on an annual basis. Commissioner Michaels followed up with a question about the environmental friendliness of the different systems. She asked whether biodiesel was being considered for bus rapid transit. Mr. Soronson said that the new Valley Metro buses are not biodiesel. Ms. O'Connor added that the Scottsdale trolley vehicles are biodiesel. She opined that the big difference is between electric technology and fuel technology, rather than comparing different fuels.

Commissioner Michaels asked about differences between tracks and how they would affect pedestrians crossing the street. Ms. O'Connor said that the Phoenix/East Valley light rail transit system under construction uses paved tracks, so there are no gaps and the system is accessible to pedestrians. This is a function of design. In any case, tracks at pedestrian crossings would be paved.

Commissioner Michaels asked about running light rail through Downtown. Ms. Huish clarified this is an item for discussion. Commissioner Michaels inquired whether there is any effective difference among the operators of the various transportation types, noting that in some areas

around the country a unionized workforce adds to the operating expenses. Ms. O'Connor replied that in Arizona, transit systems are privately contracted.

Commissioner Weiss asked who staff believes is the target rider. Ms. Huish indicated that many different types of riders would be able to use the transit system. Commissioner Weiss challenged staff to narrow down this perspective. Ms. O'Connor stated that the nature of the Scottsdale Road corridor is such that there are a wide range of target riders, explaining that this corridor is a 24 hour a day corridor with a range of university, employment, residential and tourism destinations. The 101 Freeway is a commuter corridor. Investment in the Scottsdale Road corridor would be worthwhile because vehicles would have ridership around the clock. Ms. O'Connor added that the system should be universally accessible. This could potentially reduce the demand for Dial-A-Ride and Cab Connection type programs.

Commissioner Weiss responded that he mostly agreed with Ms. O'Connor's remarks. He opined that they need to think about destination points and where the stations are sited. Commissioner Weiss gave examples of how the route served and how the location of stations might make the system more or less useful to different populations. Ms. Huish noted the project would be phased. Ms. O'Connor elaborated that much of this depends on how the use of Proposition 400 and federal dollars was structured.

Commissioner Weiss noted he is concerned with the construction timeline, stating that putting an extensive system in place as quickly as possible is a priority for him. He acknowledged it is important to do things properly. Ms. O'Connor replied that staff needs to do more research to develop capital and operating cost comparisons.

Commissioner Weiss found the fact that streetcars can operate in mixed traffic appealing and was intrigued by the potential for streetcars to run on light rail lines. He wondered what the streetcars would look like and noted that the design of the stations is equally important in terms of Scottsdale pride and encouraging ridership.

Commissioner Weiss asked whether Phoenix would help defray costs of bringing transit to the Airpark, since the west side of Scottsdale Road is actually in Phoenix. Ms. O'Connor reported that staff has met with Phoenix and Paradise Valley to make them aware of what Scottsdale is contemplating. It is unknown whether either of these entities has funding identified for this corridor.

Mr. Soronson added that Valley Metro Rail has put a formula in place so that if Scottsdale wished to operate vehicles on the light rail tracks, the City would pay towards maintenance and upkeep of the regional facilities. Commissioner Weiss commented it is important to keep options open and not choose a technology that turns out to be less flexible than originally believed. It might make sense to choose streetcars and have the route go to a transfer point so that riders could take light rail transit into Phoenix. However it is important to be sure that the streetcars would be capable of running on light rail tracks for future modifications. He added that he has heard Tempe is considering adding streetcars downtown in addition to the regional light rail transit.

Ms. O'Connor noted that the concept of a spur line along Rio Salado Parkway has been around for a considerable time. This could be a discussion item at the joint meeting among the Scottsdale and Tempe citizen Transportation Commissions. Commissioner Weiss said he is interested in learning if connecting streetcar lines to the possible Tempe system would be beneficial.

Vice-Chair Davis inquired if the cost per passenger could be broken out, which would assist the Commission in decision-making. Ms. O'Connor agreed and undertook to return with a meaningful presentation of that information.

Vice-Chair Davis asked how wide the stations and guideways would be. Mr. Jim Slaker of HDR/SR Beard replied that the guideway for light rail is 13 feet wide and that the station would be 16 feet wide. For streetcars, the guideway is 12 feet wide. A precision-guided bus rapid transit guideway might be 12 feet wide. Stations for streetcars and bus rapid transit could be narrower. This would depend on the amenities to be provided at the station.

Vice-Chair Davis asked about the options for eliminating lanes. Ms. Huish said that this would be examined in the more detailed analysis. Ms. O'Connor noted that some sections of Scottsdale Road have more capacity than others. Vice-Chair Davis commented that in general, he is not in favor of eliminating vehicle lanes. Ms. O'Connor concurred it is important for the Commission to discuss this. Staff would need to provide information on the trade-offs in order to have a good discussion.

Mr. Soronson reported that the construction in Phoenix is adding lanes in places and reducing lanes in others. He outlined specific examples in different areas of Phoenix. Vice-Chair Davis expressed that Scottsdale Road in the Downtown area could not be widened and carries heavy vehicular traffic.

In reply to a further inquiry by Vice-Chair Davis, Mr. Soronson noted that the Valley Metro light rail transit stations are closer together in the downtown areas. This information is on their website. Vice-Chair Davis inquired whether there could be phased implementation of the various modes. Ms. O'Connor replied that this is a good point and has been done in other places. If Scottsdale decides on this approach, an overall plan and vision should be in place at the outset.

Vice-Chair Davis asked whether there are any plans to eliminate parking. He is skeptical of efforts to force ridership. Ridership should develop on the merits of the system. Ms. O'Connor noted this could be a topic for debate. She believes that staff should identify the tradeoffs and all the associated costs. She added that the reference earlier in the meeting to eliminating parking was a reference to the overlay ordinances that are established for the Central Phoenix/East Valley corridor. Mr. Soronson noted that he had referred to reducing parking requirements around stations to maximize developable square footage as an incentive for developers to create development types that would enhance ridership. He stressed that there was no reference to eliminating parking in order to force people to use the transit system. Vice-Chair Davis commented that not everyone lives on a transit route so providing park'n'ride lots would increase ridership.

Chair Gilliland said he is interested in transfer technologies, noting that similarities in station design would facilitate easy transfers from one mode of transit to another. He commented that park'n'ride or some other parking facility would be crucial and asked whether this was planned for the Airpark or Loop 101. Ms. Huish replied that staff is currently looking at several park'n'ride locations, and that a Loop 101 Park and Ride is funded in Proposition 400. For the most part, these facilities are north of Downtown. She reminded the Commission that along with the high capacity element of the Transportation Master Plan, there is also the overall transit plan update. These need to support each other.

Chair Gilliland noted that currently there is ample public parking in the Downtown. He asked what is planned for SkySong. Ms. O'Connor replied that garages are planned for SkySong. A

transit center will be placed at SkySong, however, there are no plans for park'n'ride lots there at this point. This could be reviewed if there is found to be a need. Chair Gilliland asked whether the SkySong transit center is envisioned as an intermediate hub or as a terminus. Ms. O'Connor replied it could serve in either capacity. It is generally seen as an opportunity to provide a hub.

Chair Gilliland inquired whether staff envisions any other transit centers along the Scottsdale Road corridor. Mr. Soronson said that SkySong is the only one currently planned. Ms. O'Connor noted that there is a transit center alternative at the Airpark.

Chair Gilliland remarked that there seems to be no terminus for the light rail option at SkySong and that light rail is not proposed through the Downtown on any of the alternatives.

Ms. Huish told the Commission they could pull back an alternative at any time. Staff had tried to make a consistent presentation to keep things simpler for discussion. Chair Gilliland noted that there seems to be an option for light rail transit to end at SkySong, or for light rail transit to go beyond Downtown. He opined that bus rapid transit throughout the entire corridor was another feasible option. These three options are missing from the current alternatives the Commission has for consideration.

Vice-Chair Davis asked if there is a reason that light rail transit throughout the corridor to the Airpark was left out of the options. Ms. O'Connor replied that the corridor is lengthy. Three cities are sharing the costs of the Valley Metro light rail transit corridor, which is 20 miles in length. The Scottsdale Road corridor is approximately 15 miles at an estimated cost of \$65 to \$70 million per mile for light rail. Mr. Soronson added that in today's dollars, the central Phoenix project cost is \$1.3 billion. They tried to keep the alternatives reasonable in cost. Ms. O'Connor suggested that Vice-Chair Davis's suggestion of starting out with one technology and over time planning a transition to another technology has possible merit over the long term, since an additional source of funding might possibly be found in the long term. Vice-Chair Davis noted it is important to ensure they are looking at affordable options.

Ms. O'Connor reminded the Commission that there will be further discussion at the August or September Transportation Commission meeting.

Mr. William Lindley of 8550 East McDowell Road addressed the meeting, speaking as a veteran transit rider. The Los Angeles Busway has reached capacity and will need to be replaced with light rail transit to handle the volume of riders. The same situation already arose in Curitiba, Brazil, which had been the poster child for bus rapid transit. He noted that light rail systems attract everyone and encourage economic development. Adjacent property in downtown areas becomes too valuable to use for large parking lots. Mr. Lindley stated that he is a transit rider and looks forward to better transit in Scottsdale, especially the service improvements that are scheduled to be implemented on July 24th.

## **5. SCHOOL SAFETY AUDITS**

Mr. George Williams presented the staff's efforts to proactively improve safety around Scottsdale schools. Staff went to every public school during the last school year in order to get a baseline of needs. Recommendations have been formulated and the most urgent have been implemented. Congestion and frustration is a typical concern. Staff observed inadequate control of student drop-off. The biggest concern staff observed at the schools were parents dropping students on the opposite side of the street so that children have to cross in busy traffic. Even if a parent accompanies the child, this is unsafe. He urged parents to drop children off



right at the school if at all possible. If this is not feasible, children should be dropped on the same side of the street as the school. Driver inattention and lack of patience were other common issues. All the activity takes place in a 10 to 15-minute window; so better planning in the morning can affect safety.

Mr. Williams outlined typical recommendations that the City can implement such as sidewalk ramps, pedestrian refuge islands, sidewalk connections, parking prohibitions near pedestrian crossings, and exits from school premises. He noted that some solutions will take much longer and staff will need to work with the school district. Mr. Williams presented photographs illustrating school drop-off and sidewalk issues.

The Department plans to continue implementation of the current recommendations and plan for future activity. In the future, staff hopes to expand this into a Safe Routes to School program and a regular Walk and Bike to School Day event. State and federal funding is available for this initiative. They would also like to expand the school audits to include private and charter schools.

Ms. O'Connor noted that Mr. Williams initiated, developed, and managed this program. He identified the issue, came up with ways to resolve the problem and tackled and completed the project. Mr. Williams took the Safe Routes to School training and developed contacts within the school district. She thanked Mr. Williams for his efforts. The Department is working to fix as many problems as possible while school is out for the summer. Mr. Meinhart concurred, saying this has been a great example of traffic engineering and transportation planning staff working together. Mr. Williams deserves the lion's share of the credit for this project.

Mr. Williams commented this was a good effort between traffic engineering and transportation planning staff.

Commissioner Michaels remarked that this was a wonderful effort. She asked about high schools, particularly in light of the major construction projects currently under way.

Mr. Williams explained that staff had an opportunity to review the sites of Chaparral, Coronado and Saguaro high schools.

Ms. O'Connor noted that the Department received a citizen request last week about reviewing the trolley stop and crosswalk at Coronado High School. Commissioner Michaels asked about the crosswalk from Coronado High School to the Boys and Girls Club. Mr. Williams said that because Coronado was under construction, an audit was not performed, since they could not identify a typical school day. Staff will revisit Coronado when school is back in session. Ms. O'Connor added that this particular crosswalk was the subject of the citizen's e-mail.

Commenting that this is an outstanding program, Commissioner Taunton recommended presenting it to other cities. He felt the approach of doing a gap analysis would be beneficial if applied to pedestrian areas downtown and in older areas of the City. Commissioner Taunton added that parents today are reluctant to allow their children to walk to school and asked about the "Safe Routes to School program." Mr. Williams replied that some schools have worked on this, but in Scottsdale it is not done as a program. In Phoenix there is a more proactive program. Doing the "Safe Routes to School program" for every school in Scottsdale would be a significant endeavor, which would involve identifying a safe route to school for every street in the city. Typically, the Department would do this because school districts have no authority to make any changes to streets.

Ms. O'Connor added that the Walk and Bike to School program encourages people to consider allowing their children to walk to school.

Mr. Meinhart shared that the Department is working on a Downtown pedestrian survey using the gap analysis to identify missing links in the system. He opined that perhaps parents should be surveyed to find out why parents will not allow children to walk or bike to school. In response to a comment by Chair Gilliland, Mr. Williams confirmed that there has also been a decrease in bus ridership to schools.

6. **CURRENT TRANSPORTATION PROJECT UPDATES**

Ms. O'Connor stated that a number of projects are in the design and construction phase. A public meeting on the design of the Pima Road project was being held at the same time as tonight's Commission meeting. Another meeting was held the night before to introduce the Canal Bank bicycle and pedestrian corridor planning effort. Staff will report on the status of these projects over the next couple of months.

A series of transit service improvements are scheduled to take effect on Monday, July 24th. Bus service hours will continue until 10:00 p.m.

With regard to the Loop 101 photo enforcement pilot project, Ms. O'Connor reported that as of July 19th, approximately 53,405 citations were filed with the Court, and 31,777 notices of violation have been issued. Warning notices are no longer being issued. The evaluation report will be issued several months after the demonstration program ends in October. Staff intends to make presentations to the Commission and to City Council in October and then in December or January when the report is available.

Ms. O'Connor undertook that at the next meeting, staff will update the Commission on a before and after analysis of neighborhood traffic management. At the last meeting, the Commissioners gave some directions for modifications for the Neighborhood Traffic Management Policies and Procedures. Staff will send this information to the Commissioners within the next few days and it will be posted on the website for public comment. She noted that some projects were started in the past and are grandfathered so that those neighborhoods do not have to wait for the new procedures to be finalized.

Vice-Chair Davis asked whether the exhibits from the open houses are placed on the website. Mr. Meinhart undertook to look into that option. Vice-Chair Davis suggested that staff could provide an update on the trails system as an agenda item at a future meeting. Mr. Meinhart said that the Canal Bank corridor study would be brought to the Commission for discussion in the future. The Commission already approved the Pima Road project so staff will provide project updates in the future. In response to an inquiry by Vice-Chair Davis, Mr. Meinhart said that the first phase of improvements on the Crosscut Canal went out for bid but no bids were received. Staff plans to reissue the project in September. Mr. Meinhart discussed applications for federal enhancement funding to do improvements on a couple of sections of the canal system. Staff is waiting to see the response at the state level.

7. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

None.

8. **COMMISSIONER COMMENTS**

None.

9. **IDENTIFICATION OF FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

Chair Gilliland noted that the Commission needs to reconsider the Commission Ordinance as discussed in the Study Session.

Commissioner Taunton commented he had attended the public meeting on the canals the night before and is looking forward to seeing that on a future meeting agenda. Mr. Meinhart responded this is likely to be on the September agenda. This would also present an opportunity to discuss plan elements for the bicycle plan.

10. **ADJOURNMENT**

With no further business to discuss, being duly moved and seconded, the meeting adjourned at 9:08 p.m.

**\*NOTE: VIDEO AND/OR AUDIO RECORDINGS OF SCOTTSDALE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEETINGS ARE AVAILABLE FROM THE SCOTTSDALE TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT FOR UP TO SIX MONTHS FOLLOWING THE MEETING DATE.**

**IN ACCORDANCE WITH PROVISIONS OF THE ARIZONA REVISED STATUTES, THE SUMMARIZED MINUTES OF THE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEETINGS ARE NOT VERBATIM TRANSCRIPTS. ONLY THE ACTIONS TAKEN AND DISCUSSION APPEARING WITH QUOTATION MARKS ARE VERBATIM.**

**SUBMITTED BY:**

**A/V Tronics**

**Officially approved by the Transportation Commission on \_\_\_\_\_**